



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,855	08/03/2001	Oliver O. Stanchfield	TPP 31390	6671

7590 02/25/2004

Stevens, Davis, Miller & Mosher, L.L.P.
Suite 850
1615 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

A, PHI DIEU TRAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,855

Applicant(s)

STANCHFIELD, OLIVER O.

Examiner

Phi D A

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-15,27,28,30,32-34,36,37 and 39-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-15,27,28,30,32-34,36,37 and 39-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 46 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claim reads on non-elected invention of figure 2-4.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 46 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, 36, 37, 39, 40, 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santarossa (6253510) in view of Margarit.

Santarossa shows a molding having a longitudinal axis (figure 1, along the length of the molding), a core (5), a surface formed of a thermosetting resin and a décor sheet (col 3 lines 1-10), the molding having a generally planar floor engaging surface(the surface of the core that mates with the surface of the pad 10, figure 1 top), a wall engaging surface (the surface of the core that mates with the surface of the pad 10, figure 1 bottom) positioned substantially

Art Unit: 3637

perpendicular to the floor engaging surface, a pad (elongated mounting surface 10) coupled to the floor engaging surface (the pad is a wrap around of the surface and is thus coupled thereto), the pad formed of a material different from the core, the pad resiliently creates a substantially moisture tight seal so as to prevent moisture from seeping between the floor and the molding when the molding is in an installed positioned (the finish and base coating being resilient and flexible), an adhesive (2) positioned on the pad, an intermediate surface (8) connecting the wall and floor engaging surfaces (3,4), the intermediate surface being angled so that the three engaging surfaces forming a generally triangular shape in a plane transverse to the longitudinal axis, a face on the molding and positioned to face outwardly from the corner, the face being at least one curve section, the pad being positioned distal a front edge (the edge closer to the corner) of the floor engaging surface, the front edge of the floor engaging surface is distal the corner (formed by 3, 4), the molding having a generally uniform cross section at planes transverse to the longitudinal axis, glue (2) being applied immediately to the pad before placing the molding in the installed condition, the pad being adjacent to the floor engaging surface, the décor sheet comprises a color or pattern adapted to be complementary to an upper surface of a floating floor.

Santarossa does not show the core formed from compressed wood particles and a binder therefor.

Santarossa discloses wood molding being a commonly used molding (col 1 lines 22-25).

Margarit discloses a molding made of high density fiberboard (col 7 lines 15-26, col 2 lines 4-7).

Art Unit: 3637

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Santarossa to show the core being formed from compressed wood particles and a binder as taught by Margarit because it is well known to have wood molding as taught by Santarossa and having the core being formed from compressed wood particles and a binder would enable material cost saving per the availability of cheap wood particles and binder, and forming the core with wood particles and a binder also enables easy forming of a variety of shapes and sizes of the molding as it requires only the change in the size and shape of the die.

3. Claims 3, 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santarossa (6253510) in view of Margarit as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of DeGraan (4655009).

Santarossa as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the molding having a wall engaging surface with apertures therein to allow a connector to pass therethrough.

DeGraan shows a molding having a wall engaging surface with apertures therein to allow a connector(26) to pass therethrough to anchor the molding to the wall in addition to the adhesive (19).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Santarossa's modified structure to show the molding having a wall engaging surface with apertures therein to allow a connector to pass therethrough because it would further enhance the fastening of the molding to a wall in addition to adhesive as taught by DeGraan.

4. Claims 1-2, 11, 36-37, 39, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith (3982780) in view of Margarit (5979132).

Keith (figure 5) shows a molding having a longitudinal axis (along the length of the molding), a core (5), a surface formed of a thermosetting resin and a décor sheet (56), the molding having a generally planar floor engaging surface (the surface at the bottom of part 51), a wall engaging surface (52a) positioned substantially perpendicular to the floor engaging surface (inherently so as the surface is to be attached to surfaces from 0-90°), a pad (55) coupled to the floor engaging surface, the pad formed of a material different from the core, the pad resiliently creates a substantially moisture tight seal so as to prevent moisture from seeping between the floor and the molding when the molding is in an installed position, an adhesive (54) positioned on the pad and configured to engage the floating floor when the molding is in the installed position, the pad is formed of a material that is a resilient material made from one of a closed cell foamed plastic material or an open cell, foamed plastic material.

Keith does not disclose the core being made of compressed wood particles and a binder thereof.

Margarit discloses a molding made of high density fiberboard (col 7 lines 15-26, col 2 lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Keith's core to show the core being formed from compressed wood particles and a binder as taught by Margarit because having the core being formed from compressed wood particles and a binder would enable material cost saving per the availability of cheap wood particles and binder, and forming the core with wood particles and a binder also enables easy forming of a variety of shapes and sizes of the molding as it requires only the change in the size and shape of the die.

Art Unit: 3637

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith (3982780) in view of Margarit (5979132) as applied to claim 11 above and further in view of Strasser.

Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the pad having a hollow formed therein.

Strasser (figure 4) discloses a hollow in the core to reduce weight of the core.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Keith's modified structure to show a hollow formed in the pad because it would reduce the weight of the foam structure as taught by Strasser and increase the resiliency of the pad.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith (3982780) in view of Margarit (5979132) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Madonia et al (4546022).

Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the pad including a preformed layer of adhesive wherein a removable film covers the adhesive.

Madonia et al shows a pad (37) including a preformed layer of adhesive wherein a removable film (39) covers the adhesive to enable easy quick bonding of the pad to another structure at the time of the usage.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Keith's modified structure to show the pad including a preformed layer of adhesive wherein a removable film covers the adhesive because it would enable easy and quick bonding of the pad to another structure at the time of usage as taught by Madonia et al.

Art Unit: 3637

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santarossa (6253510) in view of Margarit (5979132).

Santarossa as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for a floating floor.

Margarit discloses a floating floor with a molding for covering the floating floor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Santarossa's modified structure to show the molding being used with a floating floor as taught by Margarit because it is well known in the art to use a molding to cover a floating floor and wall joint.

8. Claims 27-28, 30, 32-34, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keith (3982780) in view of Margarit (5979132).

Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations including a sealant (the adhesive 54) except for a floating floor attaching to the floating floor surface.

Margarit further discloses a molding used to connect a floating floor and a wall.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Keith's modified structure to show a floating floor as taught by Margarit because it is well known in the art to cover the corner of a floating floor and a wall with a molding as such covering will provide an aesthetic appearance to the corner.

Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations. The claimed method steps would have been the obvious method steps of preventing moisture from into a gap between a floating floor and a molding would have been the obvious method steps of preventing moisture with Keith's modified structure.

Art Unit: 3637

Per claim 33, Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations except for the sealant being a silicone sealant.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Keith's modified structure to show the sealant being a silicone sealant because having an adhesive made of silicone would ensure the adhesive still functions when wet and thus ensuring the attachment of the molding to the substructure.

Keith as modified shows all the claimed limitations. The claimed method steps would have been the obvious method step of preventing moisture from seeping into a gap between a floating floor and a molding with Keith's modified structure.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3,5-15, 27-28, 30,32-34, 36-37, 39-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3637

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phi D A whose telephone number is 703-306-9136. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703-308-2486. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Phi Dieu Tran A', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Phi Dieu Tran A
2/23/03